

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 2, 6-8, 10, 12, 14, 15 and 18 have been amended to improve their readability without narrowing their scope. Claim 3 has been amended to further define the invention of that claim. Support for the amendment to claim 3 can be found at least on page 12, line 8 and page 13, line 6. No new matter has been added.

This amendment changes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-20 are now pending in this application.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant filed an Information Disclosure Statement on January 26, 2004 with accompanying Form PTO/SB/08 listing documents. Applicant respectfully requests that any listed document be considered by the Examiner and be made of record in the present application and that an initialed copy of Form PTO/SB/08 be returned in accordance with MPEP §609.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 1-6 and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,574,443 to Hsieh (hereafter “Hsieh”). Claims 7-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsieh in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,441,943 to Roberts et al. (hereafter “Roberts”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 1, 19 and 20 are all directed to an outside mirror for a vehicle comprising “a visible-light emitting unit that emits visible light” and where “the visible-light emitting unit is arranged such that the visible light emitted does not directly enter into the

image capturing unit.” Hsieh and Roberts fail to disclose at least these features of claims 1, 19 and 20, or their attendant advantages.

Hsieh discloses a plurality of video cameras 2 including a left video camera CCD 3 mounted in a left-sideview mirror 14 of a car 1 (col. 2, lines 5-12). The video camera 2 includes a CCD, a light-transmissive shield 22, and “an illuminator 23 mounted in the housing 21 such as an infrared illuminator for a visible sensing of the external subject at night or darkness.” (Col. 2, line 64 – col. 3, line 8).

Hsieh, however, does not disclose an outside mirror for a vehicle comprising “a visible-light emitting unit that emits visible light” and where “the visible-light emitting unit is arranged such that the visible light emitted does not directly enter into the image capturing unit.” The Office Action equates the illuminator 23 with the visible light emitting unit as claimed. Hsieh, however, discloses the illuminator 23 to be an infrared illuminator. Thus, the illuminator 23 emits infrared radiation, not visible light as is emitted by the visible-light emitting unit as recited in claims 1, 19 and 20. Thus, Hsieh fails to disclose a limitation of claims, 1, 19 and 20, and fails to anticipate these claims.

Roberts fails to cure the deficiencies of Hsieh. Roberts was cited for allegedly disclosing both visible light and infrared light emitting units in an outside mirror. Roberts, however, fails to disclose an outside mirror for a vehicle comprising an image capturing unit, and thus further fails to disclose the arrangement of any visible light emitting unit of an outside mirror relative to the image capturing unit.

Moreover, even if Hsieh were modified to include a visible light emitting unit, neither Hsieh nor Roberts provides any suggestion that the visible light emitting unit should be arranged such that the visible light emitted does not directly enter into the CCD3 (image capturing unit) of Hsieh. Thus, even if Hsieh and Roberts were combined, the combination would not suggest the outside mirror as recited in claims 1, 19 or 20.

Moreover, Hsieh and Roberts fail to realize the advantages of the outside mirror as

recited in claims 1, 19 and 20. For example, the arrangement of the visible-light emitting unit such that the visible light emitted does not directly enter into the image capturing unit prevents blooming in the video image captured by the image capturing unit (see instant specification, page 9, lines 1-4). Hsieh and Roberts fail to suggest this advantage in an outside mirror with a visible-light emitting unit.

The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as their independent claims, as well as for further patentable features recited therein. For example, claim 4 further comprises a lens that transmits the visible light emitted. The Office Action equates the light-transmissive shield 22 of Hsieh with the lens as recited in claim 4. Hsieh, however, does not disclose that the transmissive shield 22 acts, or is shaped to act, as a lens. As another example, claim 6 recites that the “image capturing unit has a mechanism configured to be tilted by manual operation or by remote operation.” Hsieh does not disclose this feature. As another example, claim 3 recites “the visible-light distribution controller is configured as a reflector or a prism.” Neither Hsieh nor Roberts suggests this feature of claim 3.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date October 21, 2005

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6162
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Thomas G. Bilodeau

Pavan K. Agarwal
Registration No. 40,888

Thomas G. Bilodeau
Registration No. 43,438

Attorneys for Applicant